

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

KIM BOLIBA,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

CAMPING WORLD, INC., et al.

Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:14-cv-01840-JAD-NJK

ORDER

On June 24, 2015, the Court ordered Defendants to submit an affidavit detailing their attorney's fees, expenses and costs. Docket No. 41. Defendants have now filed an affidavit detailing hours spent by their attorneys, as well as detailing certain expenses and costs. Docket No. 45. As part of the lodestar analysis, the party requesting fees must show that the hourly rates sought are "in line with those prevailing in the community for similar services by lawyers of reasonably comparable skill, experience and reputation." *Blum v. Stenson*, 465 U.S. 886, 895 n.11 (1984). "Affidavits of the [movant's] attorney and other attorneys regarding prevailing fees in the community, and rate determinations in other cases, particularly those setting a rate for the [movant's] attorney, are satisfactory evidence of the prevailing market rate." *United Steelworkers of Am. v. Phelps Dodge Corp.*, 896 F.2d 403, 407 (9th Cir. 1990). It does not appear that Defendants have justified the hourly rates sought by their attorneys in the pending

1 affidavit.¹ Accordingly, no later than August 17, 2015, Defendants shall file supplemental information
2 supporting the hourly rates sought.

3 If Plaintiff chooses, he may respond to the hourly rates sought, the number of hours claimed, and
4 the expenses and costs. Any such response shall be filed no later than August 24, 2015.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 DATED: August 13, 2015

7 
8 _____
NANCY J. KOPPE
United States Magistrate Judge

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26 _____
27 ¹ The affidavit includes the bald assertion that “[t]he fees . . . are reasonable and within the ordinary
28 charges for similar legal work in the Las Vegas community.” *See* Docket No. 45 at 2. The affidavit does
not even explain how many years of experience counsel have, and provides no information explaining why
the hourly rates sought are proper. The Court finds the cursory statement to be insufficient.